IN THE DRAWINGS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the drawings as not illustrating the features of the invention, and particularly that the façade faces the opening of the chassis. Applicants disagree with the objection. The Examiner is apparently alleging that the term "facing" requires a particular kind of facing, and with this limited interpretation of "facing", the Examiner concludes that the drawings are deficient. Applicants contend that a fair reading of claim 2 and Figure 2 shows that the façade is "facing" the opening. The claim does not require that the façade "directly" face the opening or "face" it at any particular angle; the claim merely says that it "faces" the opening. Therefore, the language of claim 2 is illustrated in the drawings, and the objection to the drawings must be withdrawn.

Remarks

By this amendment, the abstract, specification and claims 1-10 have been revised and new claim 11 has been added to place this application in condition for allowance. Currently, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 11 are before the Examiner for consideration on their merits. Claims 3, 6, and 8 are withdrawn from consideration.

The Examiner has raised a number of informal matters concerning the drawings, claims, and specification. Each of these issues has been addressed above, and the objections should be withdrawn. More particularly, the objection to the drawings is addressed, the claims have been amended to include the appropriate article, the abstract has been revised, and the specification has been revised. In the specification, numeral 12 has been deleted when used to describe the displacement means since this numeral was already used to describe the reception structure.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, all claims have been amended and new claim 11 has been added to address the issues of indefiniteness raised in the Office Action. It is believed that the claims are now fully definite and the rejection as applied to the claims should be withdrawn.

In the prior art rejection, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on United States Patent No. 3,994,330 to Laby. Claims 1, 9, and 10 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on United States Patent No. 5,903,120 to Shin.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections based on Laby and Shin and the traversals are found under the respective headings of the applied prior art.

Laby

Laby is directed to a folding shower door and it totally unrelated to the invention. The invention is a door for an automated machine, wherein a man-machine interface on the door is appropriately positioned when the door is opened. Claim 1, as amended, defines this invention and is directed to a door that has a reception structure that has a man-machine interface mounted thereto. In the rejection, the Examiner cites structure "82" as the reception structure. However, "82" is not even mentioned in Laby. "82" in Figure 7 appears to be the cavity or space in rail 21. However, even if rail 21 were considered to be a reception structure, it lacks a man-machine interface mounted thereto. Lacking such an interface, Laby cannot anticipate claim 1.

Moreover, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Laby and add a man-machine interface to rail 21 since such a modification would make absolutely no sense whatsoever.

Further, if the Examiner were to take the position that the doors of Laby are a reception structure, at most, these doors have handles 23, which cannot be considered to be the same as the claimed man-machine interface mounted to the reception structure. While the handle could be interpreted as an interface, it is clearly not a man-machine interface. Therefore, there is no basis to reject claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) using the teachings of Laby, and the rejection must be withdrawn.

Shin

Shin is as irrelevant to the invention as Laby. Shin is directed to a washing machine having a particular type of door. In the rejection, the Examiner contends that the reception structure is the opening formed by the handle of the door. While this could arguably be considered a reception structure, the issue to be considered now is whether Shin teaches the door of claim 1 and the combination of claim 1, wherein the door has a reception structure with a man-machine interface mounted thereto. There is no man-machine interface in Shin that is mounted to the opening in the door serving as a handle. Shin cannot anticipate claims 1 and 10 for this reason, and the rejection must be withdrawn for this reason alone.

Also, Shin does not teach claim 9 as alleged in the rejection. Claim 9 states that the man-machine interface includes machine instrumentation or control means. At most, the door of Shin has a recess so that it can be grasped. There is no other structure associated with the handle, and the features of claim 9 are just not found in Shin. Therefore, this claim is separately patentable over Shin.

The same argument as set forth above regarding obviousness and the Laby reference also applies herein. Shin is clothes washing machine. The question would be whether one of skill in the art would be motivated to include a man-machine interface on the door of the washing machine. The answer to this question is a resounding no. One of skill in the art does not need to have access to a man-machine interface when the door is open since the washing machine would obviously be inoperative. Thus, it would make no sense to install a man-machine interface on the door of Shin so that an operator can have access to the interface when standing in front of the door opening. Any contention of

obviousness can only be the hindsight reconstruction of the prior art in light of Applicants' disclosure, and such a contention could not be sustained on appeal.

Summary

In summary, it is respectfully contended that neither Laby nor Shin establishes a *prima facie* case of anticipation against independent claims 1 and 10. Moreover, there is no legitimate basis to conclude that these claims are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claim 9 is also separately patentable over Shin since Shin does not teach nor suggest the features therein. Therefore, these claims along with the remaining dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the applied prior art, and the rejections based on Laby and Shin should be withdrawn.

Lastly, it is contended that claim 1 is generic to the embodiment of the elected claims as well as the embodiment of non-elected claims 3, 6, and 8. In the restriction requirement, the Examiner required election between the single and double panel doors of the invention but admitted that claims 1 and 10 are generic. Since Applicants are entitled to a reasonable number of species upon allowance of a generic claim, and generic claims 1 and 10 are now in condition for allowance, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn, and presently withdrawn claims 3, 6, and 8 should be allowed with claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 11. In this regard, claims 3, 6, and 8 have been revised in anticipation of their allowance so that they are fully definite under the purview of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to examine this application and pass claims 1-11 onto issuance.

If the Examiner believes that an interview with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned at 202-835-1753.

The above constitutes a complete response to all issues raised in the Office Action dated January 12, 2006.

Again, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no fee required for this submission, however, please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARK & BRODY

Christopher W. Brody
Registration No. 33,613

Customer No. 022902
1090 Vermont Ave. NW
Suite 250
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: 202-835-1111
Facsimile: 202-835-1755
Docket No.: 71247-0014
Date: April 12, 2006